UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,780	90,780 10/10/2006 Janez Kerc		029489-00023	1166
4372 ARENT FOX L	7590 08/26/201 LP	EXAMINER		
1050 CONNEC SUITE 400	TICUT AVENUE, N.	ARNOLD, ERNST V		
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1613	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent\_Mail@arentfox.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/590,780	KERC ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1613	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 August 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS API	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appear for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods:	ne same day as filing a Notice of A plies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid aban t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth er than SIX MONTHS from the mailing ). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exte under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sh set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nsion and the corresponding amount or ortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliant filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, bu			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cons		ΓE below);	
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	ducing or simplifying th	e issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a co	-	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicants reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		timely filed amendmen	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 13.14 and 17-21.		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-12,15 and 16</u> .  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary a	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but on See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (F 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Ernst V Arnold/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1613	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 14 has been amended to recite previoulsy un-examined functional langauge which would require further serach and consideration. It also appears that this amendment broadens the disclosed subject matter and therefore a new matter rejection appears to be appropriate. The specification as filed only mentions a tablet that meets this limitation, but the claim langauge is drawn to all compositions. Nothing has been shown that aqueous solutions of the pravastatin sodium have the same stability. It appears that this broadens the disclosed subject matter and therefore a new matter rejection appears to be appropriate.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendment requires further search and consideration. The specification on page 18, example 19 discloses that a tablet subjected to accelerated stability testing at 60 C for one month was stable but no comparative data has been provided for similar prior art compositions and the claims embrace all compositions including liquid, emulsion, suspension etc... which probably don't have the same parameters as instantly claimed and therefore a scope of enablement rejection is most likely forthcoming. The present rejections of record would have to be reconsidered in light of the new amendments. Respectfully, for at least the reasons above, the case is not in condition for allowance and claims 13, 14 and 17-21 remain rejected.